	Page 240
1	you have copies of his testimony?
2	MR. PHILLIPS: I do, Your Honor.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Be sure you have a
4	copy for Ms. Bergold. Two copies you've
5	got yours? Two copies for the Reporter's
6	copies you can give to Ms. Gosse. And I just
7	want one copy if you have one.
8	MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, Your Honor.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. I know I
10	have a set someplace, but this is easier.
11	And, of course, the witness should have up
12	there
13	MR. PHILLIPS: I don't want him to
14	put it before
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Fine. Mr.
16	Phillips, are you ready? I don't want to
17	MR. PHILLIPS: No, Your Honor, I'm
18	fine. If Your Honor is ready, I'm fine.
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: I'm all set. I'm
20	all set to go. Thank you.
21	Okay. Sir, would you please raise

your right hand?

Mr. Solomon?

A Tennis Channel is an independently owned, 24-hour, seven-day-a-week cable network that televises substantively live tennis events from all over the world, year round, with the biggest stars both in front of and behind the camera.

Q Now, you say that you are the
Chairman and CEO. Can you describe for me
what you do as the Chairman and CEO of Tennis
Channel?

A Substantively, all of the companies operations report to me. I'm responsible for building the brand, for the advertising, for the distribution, and for the management of the company, as well as the other duties associated with being Chairman.

Q By the way, as a housekeeping matter, Mr. Solomon, in front of you you have what has been marked as Tennis Channel Exhibit 14, which says it is the direct testimony of Ken Solomon. Do you see that?

	Page 243
1	(Whereupon, the above-referred to
2	document was marked as Tennis
3	Channel Exhibit No. 14 for
4	identification.)
5	A I do.
6	Q And is the testimony that you have
7	provided in this matter, sir?
8	A Yes, it is.
9	Q And do you swear that this
10	testimony is true?
11	A I do.
12	MR. PHILLIPS: Your Honor, I would
13	like to admit Exhibit 14, Mr. Solomon's
14	testimony, into evidence.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Objection?
16	MR. CARROLL: Your Honor, there is
17	no objection. There appears to be some
18	hearsay interlaced in it in places, but that
19	will be subject to examination. So no
20	objection to admitting it.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Thank you.
22	The document is marked Exhibit 14 and received

1 in evidence.

(Whereupon, the above-referred to document, previously marked as Tennis Channel Exhibit No. 14 for identification, was received into evidence.)

BY MR. PHILLIPS:

Q Mr. Solomon, to go back to The Tennis Channel, now knowing what kind of network it is, could you describe for me what types of events you cover on The Tennis Channel?

A Well, tennis is a sport that happens all around the world, and we cover the events that happen both live and on a delay basis all over the world. We have substantively all of the top hundred tournaments in the world. Those include the four majors, as they are called. Each one of those lasts about two weeks long, and we cover each of those.

And we use the biggest

personalities on the air, and we also -- we do it in high definition, which is very important in our business. And we also do original programming, so we do live-style programming, we do a significant amount of it, both live style and shows about the players.

Q You mentioned the four majors.

Can you name those for me?

A Those are Wimbledon, the French
Open, the Australian Open, and the U.S. Open.

Q And you have some rights to each of those, correct?

A We do.

Q Have you ever won or been nominated for awards for your program?

A We this past year were nominated for an Emmy for our Wimbledon coverage, which was great, by the Academy of Television Arts and Sciences. And we have received a number of other accolades from the press and from viewers in various places.

Q In addition to the tennis coverage

that you make of tournaments, what else -- what other kind of programming do you offer?

A We do a lot of worldwide field-based coverage. So we will do -- which are series and specials. We'll do documentaries about famous players. We will also do shows about the things that subscribers tend to feel are most important, because a lot of our viewers also play the game. So we will do clinic shows like Tennis Channel Academy.

We will do shows on health and fitness, which we think are very important, like Fit to Hit and others, short form, long form, and documentaries, tennis travel. We will also do quite a lot of -- tennis players seem to be very charitably oriented, so we will do charity-based tennis events like the Hit for Haiti, which we did recently, or one for the victims of the Japanese tsunami that we did recently with the top stars in the world.

Q What would you describe as the

primary focus, though, of the coverage that you have, the types of television coverage that you have?

events, and, you know, having substantively all of them in a stream throughout the year. There is, you know, the men's tour, the women's tour. There is the Davis Cup, which is obviously international competition, which we currently own as well as the slams and the other — those are probably considered the most important and the most valuable.

Q How broadly is Tennis Channel distributed?

A We have about 130 distribution partners. And if you add all of the subscribers up that those partners comprise, it is about 26 million homes that subscribe to Tennis Channel today.

Q Now, is that in any particular part of the country?

A Well, we have both individual

markets where we are distributed, but it is substantively across the entire country for the most part, because we do have national distribution partners with both satellite providers, with DirecTV, Dish Network, and others. And they generally -- as well as Cox and other on-the-ground cable distributors, as well as the telephony partners like AT&T and Verizon.

And what they tend to do is clear us, if you will, in packages, in groups of networks that are available, or tiers as they are sometimes called in our business.

Q And what kind of tier do you find yourself on with most of these distributors?

A Well, today about two-thirds of our distribution is comprised of tiers that would be considered general interest tiers.

They would have a range of both sports-based programming and other types of networks, general and information types of networks. So about two-thirds of them. A lot of people

consider that a basic level of service, either basic or what is sometimes called expanded basic in our business today.

Q I should have backed up to catch this before. For Your Honor in particular, Mr. Solomon, could you explain to me a little bit of your history and employment before you came to The Tennis Channel?

A Sure. Immediately prior to Tennis Channel, I worked for the E.W. Scripps

Corporation and helped them -- as President helped them launch a new network called Fine Living. Scripps is a company that has Home and Garden Television and the Food Network.

Prior to that, I was a President of Universal Studios Television. There I was more responsible for the prime-time network production and marketing of their shows, shows like Law and Order and prime-time sitcoms and dramas, as well as in the syndication and cable universe.

Before that, I was at a company

called DreamWorks, which was a new studio that was founded by a group of executives from the entertainment business, Jeffrey Katzenberg, Steven Spielberg, and David Geffen. I worked for them and helped build in the formative stages their worldwide television efforts.

And before that I was at Fox, at Newscorp, where -- at the division called the Fox Network, where I was head of distribution there as well as at Disney prior to that.

Q Thank you. Now, to go back to your distributors for a second, you mentioned to me that you -- you know, you have about 130 companies that distribute your network. How would you describe your relationships with your distributors?

A Well, they are great. They are partnerly as a rule. You know, we worked together to build -- to build their business and to build our business jointly and together. And so we think they are very strong, and we interface with them on a number

of levels on a regular basis.

I think a lot of the headlines are often grabbed by the negotiations for contracts, because those can be certainly very heated at times. But, really, the relationship begins after the contract is started, and it's a long process of building business together.

So we think that we are aligned, as a result, with our partners, and we have great relationships, which is why the business has done well.

Q Comcast is one of your distributors, is it not?

A They are.

Q What is your attitude about Comcast, Mr. Solomon?

A Comcast is an impressive company.

I think what they have done is remarkable, and what they have accomplished. I have said it many times to executives at the company. I have kind of grown up in this business. It's

a small business, and I know a lot of the folks at Comcast. I consider a lot of them friends. Many have been colleagues in the past. I think their achievements are terrific.

Q Well, now, Mr. Solomon, I have to ask the question: why did you bring this lawsuit?

A Well, certainly, the lawsuit has nothing to do with how we feel about the individuals of the company. Overall, we brought the lawsuit because Comcast carries us on a very narrowly distributed tier of service. And it is a tier of service that requires consumers and fans to pay extra to get it.

And so for us that is a significant impediment, not being able to get to the majority of the one in four homes that Comcast essentially controls access to in this country. So that is sort of problem number one, is we are not able to get the content and

the result of our efforts to the consumers.

The second issue is that Comcast is not only a distributor, but they are also a direct competitor, in that they own some or all of -- a significant portion of the networks that we consider direct competitors.

And those networks don't have the additional surcharge that we -- the customers don't have to pay the additional surcharge -- subscribers -- that they do for Tennis

Channel, and that they are much more widely distributed by many, many millions of homes, and that puts us at a competitive disadvantage.

O When --

A So -- I'm sorry, I didn't really complete the thought. And so what we are really here -- and the reason why we brought suit is simply to get equal treatment for our channel, for what theirs are getting.

And substantively, from a content standpoint, we have rights that are

equivalent, if not more extensive, in our sport. They are certainly as high, if not a higher, caliber. It's hard to argue that they're not of a higher caliber. Our ratings are very often -- certainly significantly similar, if not superior. We like to think they are superior. And we do it all for less money.

Q What networks in particular are you referring to, sir?

Versus are two that are very similar to Tennis Channel in a number of ways. They are directly in our competitive set in a -- in virtually every way that matters in our business. Obviously, the Football Network is one. They don't own that one. But the Major League Baseball Network is a big one, and the NHL Network, the Hockey Network, is one, and the NBA Network, the basketball network.

The good news is we found out that the head of the basketball network likes

Tennis Channel, so at least we have one happy consumer out there.

Q How do you feel about sports tiers, Mr. Solomon?

A Well, sports tiers, as a rule,
haven't been very successful. And, you know,
I think there is nobody that has sort of
echoed that sentiment more loudly than
Comcast. They seem to agree with us
vehemently in that regard. Comcast owns a
piece or all of a number of sports networks,
yet on their very own distribution system they
don't have one of them there.

So for -- we wonder why, if they think it would be a good idea, they don't put their sports networks there, and they haven't. That is the inward manifestation of how -- and they seem to agree with us. On the outward manifestation, it seems to be equally clear.

Comcast, as a program distributor, their distribution executives are out there telling all of their distributors outside of

themselves that they are fighting very hard to not ever be on a sports tier only level of distribution, as do we. So we seem to be in agreement on that.

Q Does that mean, Mr. Solomon, that you are against all sports tiers?

A Well, no. Our business is interesting, because the nomenclature can be a little bit fuzzy sometimes. Sports tier, as a word, is fine. There are distributors who have sports tiers that are much broader than Comcast's very narrow definition, which is about a 10 percent penetration level, one in 10 viewers or subscribers if you will.

Cox comes to example. Cox is a distribution company based in Atlanta. They are a very good partner of ours and have been for a long time. They are a cable distributor, an MSO. And they have what they call a sports and information tier. The sports and information tier has a mixture of networks like Tennis Channel, Golf Channel,

of their

Versus, the Hockey Channel, but they also have networks like Bloomberg News on it.

And so that sports tier, which is, again, a sports and information tier, is in

homes. So that seems pretty good. That is okay. We like that.

Q Well, now but you're on the sports
-- narrow sports tier with some other
distributors, sir, are you not?

A We are. It is interesting,
because many of the networks that are allowed
by virtue of their license with us to -- and
may have started with Tennis Channel on a
sports tier, have seen the evolution of our
network. And since they have seen the growth
in terms of the content, the value proposition
that we have offered through our investment,
have what they have called melted us down or
migrated us to broader distribution.

So we may remain on a sports tier or not, but they will then expand us to a more

broad tier of service. And that has happened with quite a significant amount of them.

Still, there are others who we're in conversation with, like the Time Warner, for example. Time Warner was a deal that was done back I believe in pre-2003 when we launched, a long time ago by today's standards, and certainly in the entertainment business standard, and the cable business standard, nearing a decade probably since that deal was signed.

We have had -- Time Warner has told us that they recognize the evolution and value that we have brought to this channel since this -- they did the deal with us. I think Tennis Channel was a theory when they signed up and said, "Hey, this might be a good idea." And since they have seen it grow, they have entertained conversations with us, and we are hopeful that they are going to follow suit with the other networks who have already migrated us to broader distribution.

Q Now, and as for recent deals,
where have you -- what level of distribution
have you achieved?

A In the last few years, we haven't
been asked to do -- well, let's put it this

been asked to do -- well, let's put it this
way. We haven't been forced to do any deals
that give us narrow distribution or sports
tier only distribution. Every deal in quite
the last few years has been -- that we have
had control over, I should say, has been for
broader than sports tier distribution, some
form of general entertainment tier that gives
us broad distribution.

Q Now, you approached Comcast in 2006 and 2007 and made an offer pursuant to an MFN clause to them for broader distribution, is that right, sir? I want to refer you to that for a moment.

A Yes, we did.

Q And what did Comcast tell you at that time?

A Well, I believe that --

MR. CARROLL: Your Honor, just a note. This is not in this witness' direct testimony. It was omitted from his direct testimony. I'm going to let it go, but I just want to note this is not covered in any of the direct testimony offered. But I'll let it go.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: I can't recall the specific conversations, but I think in both cases Comcast elected to not -- you know, they were shown the success that we had at those -- each of those times, and we were obligated and happy, pursuant upon our obligations through the MFN, to offer them expanded distribution, and they chose not to take us up on it.

BY MR. PHILLIPS:

Q Well, after you were turned down by them that second time, what did you do to address distribution concerns?

A Well, I think that what we did was focus our efforts, both before and after that time, on building the best service possible.

I have been in the business for a long time, as we discussed. And it was my opinion that the most important thing we could do was make a service that was not only as good, but frankly, because we weren't owned by them or any other distributor, better.

That if we could make something that was clearly better in terms of -- as good, if not better, and we felt we had to be better in terms of value, that it would make it irresistible for them to give us the broader distribution that we sought.

So we set about to do a number of things. The first thing was to ask for more money from our investors, a lot of it, to invest first and foremost in rights. And we went from -- the initial concept of Tennis Channel was only 20 secondary tournaments to today where we have substantively every top hundred tournament in the world, most of which we have exclusively, and the majors, which we happily share with some partners.

We also invested in contracts with the most famous and well-known announcers and former players and legends of the business, like Jimmy Connors, John McEnroe, Martina Navratilova, and they are wonderful and don't come cheap. But we felt that it was really important to put the best editorial face next to the content to make the best product possible.

We did other things that you do in our business. One was to get out in front of high definition. Even though we were a smaller and evolving network, we spent many, many millions of dollars building a standalone television studio just so that we could facilitate a 24-hour, seven-day-a-week, high definition signal, which is a completely separate second channel that mirrors the first channel, but for a variety of reasons I don't need to go into requires a lot of investment, time, effort, and money to do.

And we did a lot of other things,

but what was most important is we did them all without ever passing those costs on to the distributor. We felt if we could make a package that was that valuable for both our distribution partners like Comcast, as well as for their consumers, that eventually we would earn our way, which is what we really wanted to do, into the kind of broader distribution that they afforded their own networks.

Q Well, Mr. Solomon, I going to be very specific about it. Since July 2007, what grand slam tournaments have you added to The Tennis Channel?

A Well, July 2007 we would have just completed our very first French Open. Since then, in 2008, we added the rights to the French Open. We had our first Australian Open in January of 2008. We added the rights to the U.S. Open in late 2008 for the first telecast of 2009. We added a lot of personalities like Jimmy Connors, who was really tough to get, and Lindsay Davenport.

We have kept and renewed our existing talent, all of whom it's not so easy to hold onto.

We took the U.S. Davis Cup rights, which we used to share with Versus, we took
100 percent control of those, as well as the
international Davis Cup rights and the Fed Cup
rights.

We took the Men's and Women's

Finals, which happened in the fourth quarter

at the end of the year, those are the tour

finals of the ATP and the WTA, which are the

men's tour and the women's tour, and a lot of

other things, you know, along the away, as an

investment.

Q You said you used to share the Davis Cup with Versus until 2008. What do you mean by that?

A Well, the Davis Cup, which is the international sort of Olympics of tennis, where teams compete by country, there are really two packages. There is the international package, which is all of the

other, and then there is the U.S. package.

2.0

We used to share the U.S. package with Versus for domestic production and distribution. And we had to, because the purveyor of those rights, who is the USTA and the ITF, who is the International Tennis Federation, and the United States Tennis Association, felt that we needed broader distribution and to be stronger.

When we got strong enough, they gave us the right exclusively to telecast the U.S. Open. I think they were pleased to have us as a telecaster, because it was our expertise in broadcasting tennis, whereas it wasn't necessarily at that time a core competency for Versus.

JUDGE SIPPEL: What year was that?

THE WITNESS: I believe that we
took the rights in -- after the -- it would
have been for 2008, I believe. So after the
2007 finals where the U.S. actually won, and